

REMARKS

In view of the above amendments and the following remarks, reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

The drawings were objected to for failing to show the claimed “data multiplexing unit.” Specifically, the objection states that it is not clear from the specification what constitutes the data multiplexing unit in Figure 8.

Further, the specification was objected to for failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. The objection states that the “packet replacement unit” as recited in the claims is not consistent with components illustrated in figure 8.

In view of the above, proposed drawing amendments are submitted herewith under a separate cover letter. Specifically, figure 8 has been amended to identify the “data multiplexing unit” as including the channel buffer 101 the packet output unit 107 the multiplexing order storage unit 104, the flag generation unit 105, the multiplexing order generation unit 103, and the multiplexing total number control unit 106. Further, figure 8 has been amended to identify the packet stream storage unit.

In addition, figure 8 has been amended to identify the packet replacement unit as including the packet replacement subunit 112, the address obtainment unit 110 the null packet detection unit 111 and the packet number obtainment unit 109. By these amendments, no new matter has been added.

Moreover, the description of the invention referencing figure 8 has been amended to remain consistent with the above-mentioned drawing amendments.

Thus, it is respectfully submitted that the objections to the drawings and specification are no longer applicable, because figure 8 and the specification now identify the data multiplexing unit and provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. Therefore, withdrawal of these objections is respectfully requested.

Independent claims 1, 12, 13 and 14 have been amended to include the subject matter of dependent claim 6, which is now cancelled. It is noted that the “packet stream storage unit” of previously presented claim 6 is now identified as a “channel buffer” in amended claims 1, 12, 13 and 14. Further, it is noted that claims 1, 12, 13 and 14 have been amended to further define the limitations recited in previously presented claim 6. In addition, claim 15 has been cancelled.

Claims 6, 7 and 15 were identified by the Examiner as being allowable if rewritten in

independent form to include all of the limitations of base claim 1. The Applicants would like to thank the Examiner for this indication of allowable subject matter.

Claims 1, 4, 5 and 8-14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over various combinations of Bertram et al. (U.S. 6,996,098), Robinett et al. (U.S. 6,744,785), and Cheung (U.S. 6,781,601).

As mentioned above, independent claims 1, 12, 13 and 14 have been amended to include the subject matter of dependent claim 6, which was identified by the Examiner as containing allowable subject matter.

Accordingly, in view of the Examiner's indication of allowable subject matter as discussed above, it is submitted that amended independent claims 1, 12, 13 and 14 and claims 4, 5 and 7-11 that depend therefrom are allowable.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is submitted that the present application is now in condition for allowance and an early notification thereof is earnestly requested. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone to resolve any remaining issues.

Respectfully submitted,

Akihiro SATO

/Andrew L. Dunlap/

By: 2008.04.09 15:23:41 -04'00'

Andrew L. Dunlap
Registration No. 60,554
Attorney for Applicant

ALD/led
Washington, D.C. 20006-1021
Telephone (202) 721-8200
Facsimile (202) 721-8250
April 9, 2008